arXiv:1208.1056v1 [math.ST] 5 Aug 2012

# Sequential Estimation Methods from Inclusion Principle [*]

Xinjia Chen

August 2012

**Abstract**

In this paper, we propose new sequential estimation methods based on inclusion principle. The main idea is to reformulate the estimation problems as constructing sequential random intervals and use confidence sequences to control the associated coverage probabilities. In contrast to existing asymptotic sequential methods, our estimation procedures rigorously guarantee the pre-specified levels of confidence.

## 1 Introduction

An important issue of parameter estimation is the determination of sample sizes. However, the appropriate sample size usually depends on the parameters to be estimated from the sampling process. To overcome this difficulty, an adaptive approach, referred to as sequential estimation method, has been proposed in sequential analysis, where the sample size is not fixed in advance. Instead, data is evaluated as it is collected and further sampling is stopped in accordance with a pre-defined stopping rule as significant results are observed. In the area of sequential estimation, a wide variety of sampling schemes have been proposed to achieve prescribed levels of accuracy and confidence for the estimation results. Unfortunately, existing sequential estimation methods are dominantly of asymptotic nature. That is, the guarantee of the pre-specified confidence level comes only as the margin of error approaches zero or equivalently the average sample size tends to infinity. Since any practical sampling scheme must employ a finite sample size, the application of asymptotic sequential methods inevitably introduce unknown statistical error. To overcome the limitations of existing asymptotic sequential estimation methods, we shall develop new sampling schemes by virtue of the *inclusion principle* proposed in [6, 7].

In our paper [6, 7], we have demonstrated that a wide variety of sequential estimation problems can be cast into the general framework of constructing a *sequential random interval* of a prescribed level of coverage probability. To ensure the requirement of coverage probability, we propose to use a sequence of confidence intervals, referred to as *controlling confidence sequence*, to define a stopping rule such that the sequential random interval must include the controlling confidence sequence at the termination of the sampling process. In situations that no other requirement imposed on the sequential random interval except the specification of coverage probability, we have proposed a more specific version of this principle for constructing sampling schemes as follows: *The sampling process is continued until the controlling confidence sequence is included by the sequential random interval at some stage.* Such a general method of constructing sequential estimation procedures is referred to as *Inclusion Principle*, which can be justified by the following probabilistic results.

**Theorem 1** *Let* $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \{\mathscr{F}_\ell\}, \Pr)$ *be a filtered space. Let* $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ *be a proper stopping time with support* $I_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$. *For* $\ell \in I_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$, *let* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_\ell$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_\ell$ *be random intervals defined by random variables measurable in* $\mathscr{F}_\ell$. *Assume that*

---

[*] The author had been previously working with Louisiana State University at Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA, and is now with Department of Electrical Engineering, Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge, LA 70813, USA; Email: chenxinjia@gmail.com

$\{\boldsymbol{\tau} = \ell\} \subseteq \{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_\ell \subseteq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_\ell\}$ *for* $\ell \in I_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}$. *Then,* $\Pr\{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{B}}_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\} \geq \Pr\{\theta \in \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_\ell \text{ for } \ell \in I_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}\} \geq 1 - \sum_{\ell \in I_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}} \Pr\{\theta \notin \boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}_\ell\}$ *for any real number* $\theta$.

See [6] for a proof. This theorem implies that the coverage probability of the sequential random interval constructed based on the inclusion principle is bounded from below by the coverage probability of the controlling confidence sequence.

The remainder of the present paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we shall apply the inclusion principle to develop analytic stopping rules for estimating the parameters of binomial, geometric and Poisson distributions. For wider applications, we address the problem of estimating a binomial proportion in a more general setting of estimating the mean of a bounded random variable. To make the stopping rules as simple as possible, we have made effort to eliminate the need of computing confidence limits. In Section 3, we further consider the problem of estimating the mean of a bounded random variable by taking into account the information of sample variance. Section 4 is the conclusion. The justification of stopping rules and proofs of theorems are given in Appendices. The main results of this paper have appeared in our conference paper [4].

Throughout this paper, we shall use the following notations. Let "$A \vee B$" denote the maximum of $A$ and $B$. Let $\mathbb{N}$ denote the set of positive integers. Let $\mathbb{R}$ denote the set of real numbers. Let $\Pr\{E\}$ denote the probability of event $E$. The expectation of a random variable is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[.]$. The other notations will be made clear as we proceed.

# 2 Analytic Stopping Rules

In this section, we shall propose various analytic stopping rules for estimating mean values of random variables with pre-specified precision and confidence levels. More formally, let $X$ be a random variable with mean $\mathbb{E}[X]$. The general problem is to estimate $\mathbb{E}[X]$ based on i.i.d. samples $X_1, X_2, \cdots$ of $X$ by virtue of sequential sampling. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\overline{X}_n$ denote the sample mean of $X$, i.e., $\overline{X}_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$. When the sampling process is terminated with sample number $\mathbf{n}$, the sample mean $\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}}$ is taken as an estimate for $\mathbb{E}[X]$. To describe our stopping rules, we need to introduce some bivariate functions as follows.

Define function $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(.,.)$ such that

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z,\theta) = \begin{cases} z \ln \frac{\theta}{z} + (1-z) \ln \frac{1-\theta}{1-z} & \text{for } z \in (0,1),\ \theta \in (0,1), \\ \ln(1-\theta) & \text{for } z = 0,\ \theta \in (0,1), \\ \ln \theta & \text{for } z = 1,\ \theta \in (0,1), \\ -\infty & \text{for } z \in (-\infty,\infty),\ \theta \notin (0,1). \end{cases}$$

Define function $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(.,.)$ such that

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(z,\theta) = \begin{cases} z \ln \frac{z}{\theta} + (1-z) \ln \frac{1-z}{1-\theta} & \text{for } z \in (1,\infty),\ \theta \in (1,\infty), \\ -\ln \theta & \text{for } z = 1,\ \theta \in (1,\infty), \\ -\infty & \text{for } z \in [1,\infty),\ \theta \notin (1,\infty). \end{cases}$$

Define function $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(.,.)$ such that

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z,\theta) = \begin{cases} z - \theta + z \ln \left(\frac{\theta}{z}\right) & \text{for } z > 0,\ \theta > 0, \\ -\theta & \text{for } z = 0,\ \theta > 0, \\ -\infty & \text{for } z \geq 0,\ \theta \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

## 2.1 Estimation of Means of Bounded Random Variables

Let $X$ be a random variable such that $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu \in (0,1)$ and $0 \leq X \leq 1$. Let $\delta \in (0,1)$. To estimate $\mu$ with a margin of absolute error $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and confidence level $1-\delta$, we consider sampling procedures of $s$

stages. Let $m_1, m_2, \cdots, m_s$ be an ascending sequence of positive integers such that $m_s \geq \frac{\ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{2\varepsilon^2}$. Let $\mathscr{N}$ be a subset of positive integers which contains $\{m_1, \cdots, m_s\}$. We propose two stopping rules as follows:

**Stopping Rule A**: Continue sampling until $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell},\ \frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for some integers $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$.

**Stopping Rule B**: Continue sampling until $\left[\left|\overline{X}_n - \frac{1}{2}\right| - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{3(n \vee m_\ell)}\right]^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} - \left(\frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\right)^2 \frac{m_\ell \varepsilon^2}{2 \ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}$ for some integers $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$.

In Appendices A.1 and A.2, we have shown that for both stopping rules A and B, the sample mean $\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}}$ at the termination of the sampling process guarantees that $\Pr\{|\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \mu| < \varepsilon\} \geq 1 - \delta$. To avoid unnecessary checking of the stopping conditions, we suggest choosing $m_1 \geq \frac{\ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{\ln \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}}$ for Stopping Rule A and $m_1 \geq \left(\frac{24\varepsilon - 16\varepsilon^2}{9}\right) \frac{\ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{2\varepsilon^2}$ for Stopping Rule B, respectively. For purpose of efficiency, we recommend choosing $m_1, \cdots, m_s$ as a geometric sequence, i.e., $\frac{m_{\ell+1}}{m_\ell}$ is approximately equal for $\ell = 1, \cdots, s-1$.

Next, consider the problem of estimating $\mu$ with a margin of relative error $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and confidence level $1 - \delta$. Let $\delta_1, \delta_2, \cdots$ be a sequence of positive numbers such that $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \delta_\ell = \delta \in (0,1)$. Let $m_1, m_2, \cdots$ be an ascending sequence of positive integers such that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{\ln(\delta_\ell)}{m_\ell} = 0$. Let $\mathscr{N}$ be a subset of positive integers which contains $\{m_1, m_2, \cdots\}$. We propose a stopping rule as follows:

**Stopping Rule C**: Continue sampling until $\overline{X}_n > 0$ and $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon}\left(1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right),\ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for some integers $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

In Appendix A.3, we have established that for stopping rule C, the sampling process will eventually stop with probability 1 and the sample mean $\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}}$ at the termination of the sampling process guarantees that $\Pr\{|\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \mu| < \varepsilon\mu\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

## 2.2 Estimation of Means of Geometric Distributions

Let $X$ be a random variable having a geometric distribution with mean $\theta \in (1, \infty)$. Let $\varepsilon,\ \delta \in (0,1)$. To estimate $\theta$, we consider sampling procedures of $s$ stages. Let $m_1, m_2, \cdots, m_s$ be an ascending sequence of positive integers. Let $\mathscr{N}$ be a subset of positive integers which contains $\{m_1, \cdots, m_s\}$. Under the assumption that $m_s \geq \frac{(1+\varepsilon) \ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{(1+\varepsilon)\ln(1+\varepsilon) - \varepsilon}$, we propose the following stopping rule:

**Stopping Rule D**: Continue sampling until $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\left(1 + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right)\overline{X}_n,\ (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for some $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$.

In Appendix A.4, we have proved that for stopping rule D, the sample mean $\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}}$ at the termination of the sampling process guarantees that $\Pr\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} < \theta < (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}}\} \geq 1 - \delta$. To avoid unnecessary checking of the stopping condition, we suggest choosing $m_1 \geq \frac{\ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{\ln(1+\varepsilon)}$ for Stopping Rule D. For purpose of efficiency, we recommend choosing $m_1, \cdots, m_s$ as a geometric sequence. It should be noted that the estimation of a binomial proportion $p$ with a margin of relative error $\varepsilon$ can be accomplished by such method if $\frac{1}{p}$ is identified as $\theta$.

## 2.3 Estimation of Poisson Parameters

Let $X$ be a random variable having a Poisson distribution with mean $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1$. To estimate $\lambda$, we consider sampling procedures of infinitely many stages. Let $\delta_1, \delta_2, \cdots$ be a sequence of positive numbers such that $\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} \delta_\ell = \delta \in (0,1)$. Let $m_1, m_2, \cdots$ be an ascending sequence of positive integers such that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \frac{\ln(\delta_\ell)}{m_\ell} = 0$. Let $\mathscr{N}$ be a subset of positive integers which contains $\{m_1, m_2, \cdots\}$.

To estimate $\lambda$ with a margin of absolute error $\varepsilon$ and confidence level $1 - \delta$, we propose the following stopping rule:

**Stopping Rule E**: Continue sampling until $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_n + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell},\ \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for some integers $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

In Appendix A.5, we have established that for stopping rule E, the sampling process will eventually stop with probability 1 and the sample mean $\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}}$ at the termination of the sampling process guarantees that $\Pr\{|\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \lambda| < \varepsilon\} \geq 1 - \delta$. To estimate $\lambda$ with a margin of relative error $\varepsilon$ and confidence level $1 - \delta$, we propose the following stopping rule:

**Stopping Rule F**: Continue sampling until $\overline{X}_n > 0$ and $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \; \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for some integers $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

In Appendix A.6, we have established that for stopping rule F, the sampling process will eventually stop with probability 1 and the sample mean $\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}}$ at the termination of the sampling process guarantees that $\Pr\{|\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \lambda| < \varepsilon\lambda\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

# 3 Estimation of Means and Variances of Bounded Variables

In Section 2.1, we have proposed sequential methods for estimating the mean of a bounded random variable. However, the information of sample variance is not used in these methods. In this section, we shall exploit the information of sample variance for purpose of improving the efficiency of estimation. To apply the inclusion principle to construct an estimation procedure for estimating the mean of a bounded random variable, we need to have a confidence sequence for the mean. The construction of the required confidence sequence can be accomplished by applying Bonferroni's inequality to a sequence of fixed-sample-size confidence intervals. Therefore, in the sequel, we shall first study the construction of fixed-sample-size confidence intervals for the mean and variance of a bounded random variable.

Since any bounded random variable can be expressed as a linear function of a random variable bounded in $[0, 1]$, it will loss no generality to consider a random variable $X$ bounded in interval $[0, 1]$, which has mean $\mu \in (0, 1)$ and variance $\sigma^2 > 0$. Let $X_1, \cdots, X_n$ be i.i.d. samples of $X$. Define $\overline{X} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n X_i}{n}$ and $\overline{V} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \overline{X})^2}{n}$. In many situations, it is desirable to construct confidence intervals for $\mu$ and $\sigma^2$ based on $\overline{X}$ and $\overline{V}$. For this purpose, we need to make use of Hoeffding's inequalities. Specifically, define

$$\varphi(z, \nu, \theta) = \left( 1 - \frac{z\nu}{\nu^2 + \theta} \right) \ln \frac{\theta + \nu(\nu - z)}{\theta} + \frac{z\nu}{\nu^2 + \theta} \ln \frac{z}{\nu}$$

for $0 < z < \nu < 1$ and $0 < \theta < 1$. Define $\psi(z, \nu, \theta) = \varphi(1 - z, 1 - \nu, \theta)$ for $0 < \nu < z < 1$ and $0 < \theta < 1$. Define $\phi(z, \theta) = (1 - z) \ln \frac{1-z}{1-\theta} + z \ln \frac{z}{\theta}$ for $0 < z < 1$ and $0 < \theta < 1$. Hoeffding's inequalities assert that

$$\Pr\{\overline{X} \geq z\} \leq \exp(-n\psi(z, \mu, \sigma^2)) \leq \exp(-n\phi(z, \mu)) \qquad \text{for } 0 < \mu < z,$$
$$\Pr\{\overline{X} \leq z\} \leq \exp\left(-n\varphi(z, \mu, \sigma^2)\right) \leq \exp(-n\phi(z, \mu)) \qquad \text{for } z < \mu < 1.$$

We have the following results.

**Theorem 2**

$$\frac{\partial \psi(z, \mu, \theta)}{\partial \mu} \leq 0 \qquad \textit{for } 0 < \mu < z, \tag{1}$$
$$\frac{\partial \psi(z, \mu, \theta)}{\partial \theta} \leq 0 \qquad \textit{for } 0 < \theta < 1, \tag{2}$$
$$\frac{\partial \varphi(z, \mu, \theta)}{\partial \mu} \geq 0 \qquad \textit{for } 0 < z < \mu, \tag{3}$$
$$\frac{\partial \varphi(z, \mu, \theta)}{\partial \theta} \leq 0 \qquad \textit{for } 0 < \theta < 1. \tag{4}$$

See Appendix B for a proof.

## 3.1 Confidence Interval for Mean Value

For simplicity of notations, define $W_\nu = \overline{V} + (\overline{X} - \nu)^2$ for $0 \leq \nu \leq 1$. For constructing a confidence interval for the mean, we have the following method.

**Theorem 3** *Let $\delta \in (0,1)$. Define*

$$L = \begin{cases} \sup \left\{ \nu \in (0, \overline{X}) : \; \max \left[ \psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta), \; \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) \, \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}} \right] > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n} \text{ for all } \vartheta \in (0, \nu(1-\nu)] \right\} & \text{if } \overline{X} > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } \overline{X} = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$U = \begin{cases} \inf \left\{ \nu \in (\overline{X}, 1) : \; \max \left[ \varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta), \; \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) \, \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}} \right] > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n} \text{ for all } \vartheta \in (0, \nu(1-\nu)] \right\} & \text{if } \overline{X} < 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } \overline{X} = 1, \end{cases}$$

*where $\mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}}$ is the indicator function which takes value $1$ if $\vartheta > W_\nu$ and otherwise tales value $0$. Then,* $\Pr\{L \leq \mu \leq U\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

See Appendix C for a proof. The computation of the confidence limits is addressed in the sequel.

### 3.1.1 Adaptive Scanning Algorithms

To compute the lower confidence limit $L$, we first need to establish a method to check, for a given interval $[a, b] \subseteq [0, \overline{X}]$, whether the following statement is true:

$$\text{For every } \nu \in [a,b], \max \left[ \psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta), \; \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) \, \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}} \right] > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n} \text{ for all } \vartheta \in (0, \nu(1-\nu)] \, . \tag{5}$$

To check the truth of (5) without exhaustive computation, our approach is to find a sufficient condition for (5) so that the conservativeness of the sufficient condition diminishes as the width of the interval $[a, b]$ decreases. For simplicity of notations, let $c = \max\{a(1-a), b(1-b)\}$. As a consequence of (1), we have $\psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta) \geq \psi(\overline{X}, b, \vartheta)$ for all $\nu \in [a, b]$. Since $W_b \leq W_\nu \leq W_a$ for $\nu \in [a, b]$ and $\phi(z, \vartheta)$ is non-increasing with respect to $z \in (0, \vartheta)$, we have $\phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}} \geq \phi(W_a, \vartheta) \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_a\}}$ for $\nu \in [a, b]$. Hence, a sufficient condition for (5) is as follows:

$$\max \left[ \psi(\overline{X}, b, \vartheta), \; \phi(W_a, \vartheta) \, \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_a\}} \right] > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n} \text{ for all } \vartheta \in (0, c] \, . \tag{6}$$

The truth of statement (6) can be checked by virtue of the following facts:

- In the case of $W_a \geq c$, it follows from (2) that statement (6) is true if and only if $\psi(\overline{X}, b, c) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$.
- In the case of $W_a < c$, it follows from (2) that statement (6) is true if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi(\overline{X}, b, W_a) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}, \\ & \max \left[ \psi(\overline{X}, b, \vartheta), \; \phi(W_a, \vartheta) \right] > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n} \quad \text{for all } \vartheta \in (W_a, c] \, . \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The truth of statement (7) can be checked by making use of the following observations:

- In the case of $\phi(W_a, c) \leq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$, we have $\phi(W_a, \vartheta) \leq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$ for all $\vartheta \in (W_a, c]$, since $\phi(W_a, \vartheta)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\vartheta \in (W_a, c)$. It follows from (2) that statement (7) is true if and only if $\psi(\overline{X}, b, c) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$.
- In the case of $\phi(W_a, c) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$, there exists a $\theta^* \in (W_a, c)$ such that $\phi(W_a, \theta^*) = \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$, since $\phi(W_a, \theta)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\theta \in (W_a, c)$. Thus, $\phi(W_a, \vartheta) \leq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$ for all $\vartheta \in (W_a, \theta^*]$. It follows from (2) that statement (7) is true if and only if $\psi(\overline{X}, b, \theta^*) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$. In practice, $\theta^*$ can be replaced by a lower bound $\underline{\theta}$ which is extremely tight (for example, $0 < \theta^* - \underline{\theta} < 10^{-10}$). Such a lower bound $\underline{\theta}$ can be obtained by a bisection search method.

Therefore, through the above discussion, we have developed a rigorous method for checking the truth of (6). Based on this critical subroutine, we propose an efficient method for computing the lower confidence limit $L$ for $\overline{X} > 0$ as follows.

```
∇ Choose initial step size $d > \eta$, where $\eta$ is an extremely small number(e.g., $10^{-15}$) .
∇ Let $F \leftarrow 0$ and $a \leftarrow 0$.
∇ While $F = 0$, do the following:
    ◇ Let st $\leftarrow 0$ and $\ell \leftarrow 2$;
    ◇ While st $= 0$, do the following:
        ⋆ Let $\ell \leftarrow \ell - 1$ and $d \leftarrow d2^{\ell}$.
        ⋆ If $a + d < \overline{X}$, then let $b \leftarrow a + d$. If (6) holds, then let st $\leftarrow 1$ and $a \leftarrow b$.
        ⋆ If $d < \eta$, then let st $\leftarrow 1$ and $F \leftarrow 1$.
∇ Return $a$ as the lower confidence limit $L$ for $\overline{X} > 0$.
```

We call this algorithm as *Adaptive Scanning Algorithm*, since it adaptively scans the interval $[0, \overline{X}]$ to check the truth of (6).

To compute the upper confidence limit $U$, we first need to establish a method to check, for a given interval $[a, b] \subseteq [\overline{X}, 1]$, whether the following statement is true:

$$\text{For every } \nu \in [a,b],\ \max\left[\varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta),\ \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta)\, \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}}\right] > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n} \text{ for all } \vartheta \in (0, \nu(1-\nu)]\,. \tag{8}$$

To check the truth of (8) without exhaustive computation, our approach is to find a sufficient condition for (8) so that the conservativeness of the sufficient condition diminishes as the width of the interval $[a, b]$ decreases. For simplicity of notations, let $c = \max\{a(1-a), b(1-b)\}$ as before. As a consequence of (3), we have $\varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta) \geq \varphi(\overline{X}, a, \vartheta)$ for all $\nu \in [a, b]$. Since $W_a \leq W_\nu \leq W_b$ for $\nu \in [a, b]$ and $\phi(z, \vartheta)$ is non-increasing with respect to $z \in (0, \vartheta)$, we have $\phi(W_\nu, \vartheta)\mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}} \geq \phi(W_b, \vartheta)\mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_b\}}$ for $\nu \in [a, b]$. Hence, a sufficient condition for (8) is as follows:

$$\max\left[\varphi(\overline{X}, a, \vartheta),\ \phi(W_b, \vartheta)\, \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_b\}}\right] > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n} \text{ for all } \vartheta \in (0, c]\,. \tag{9}$$

The truth of statement (9) can be checked by virtue of the following facts:

- In the case of $W_b \geq c$, it follows from (4) that statement (9) is true if and only if $\varphi(\overline{X}, a, c) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$.
- In the case of $W_b < c$, it follows from (4) that statement (9) is true if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi(\overline{X}, a, W_b) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}, \\ &\max\left[\varphi(\overline{X}, a, \vartheta),\ \phi(W_b, \vartheta)\right] > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n} \quad \text{for all } \vartheta \in (W_b, c]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The truth of statement (10) can be checked by making use of the following observations:

- In the case of $\phi(W_b, c) \leq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$, we have $\phi(W_b, \vartheta) \leq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$ for all $\vartheta \in (W_b, c]$, since $\phi(W_b, \vartheta)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\vartheta \in (W_b, c)$. It follows from (4) that statement (10) is true if and only if $\varphi(\overline{X}, a, c) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$.
- In the case of $\phi(W_b, c) > \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$, there exists a $\theta^\star \in (W_b, c)$ such that $\phi(W_b, \theta^\star) = \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$, since $\phi(W_b, \theta)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\theta \in (W_b, c)$. Thus, $\phi(W_b, \vartheta) \leq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$ for all $\vartheta \in (W_b, \theta^\star]$. It follows from (4) that statement (10) is true if and only if $\varphi(\overline{X}, a, \theta^\star) \leq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}$. In practice, $\theta^\star$ can be replaced by a lower bound $\underline{\theta}$ which is extremely tight (for example, $0 < \theta^\star - \underline{\theta} < 10^{-10}$). Such a lower bound $\underline{\theta}$ can be obtained by a bisection search method.

Therefore, through the above discussion, we have developed a rigorous method for checking the truth of (9). Based on this critical subroutine, we propose an efficient method for computing the upper confidence limit $U$ for $\overline{X} < 1$ as follows.

```
∇ Choose initial step size $d > \eta$, where $\eta$ is an extremely small number(e.g., $10^{-15}$) .
∇ Let $F \leftarrow 0$ and $b \leftarrow 1$.
∇ While $F = 0$, do the following:
        ◇ Let $\mathrm{st} \leftarrow 0$ and $\ell \leftarrow 2$;
        ◇ While $\mathrm{st} = 0$, do the following:
                ⋆ Let $\ell \leftarrow \ell - 1$ and $d \leftarrow d2^{\ell}$.
                ⋆ If $b - d > \overline{X}$, then let $a \leftarrow b - d$. If (9) holds, then let $\mathrm{st} \leftarrow 1$ and $b \leftarrow a$.
                ⋆ If $d < \eta$, then let $\mathrm{st} \leftarrow 1$ and $F \leftarrow 1$.
∇ Return $b$ as the upper confidence limit $U$ for $\overline{X} < 1$.
```

We call this algorithm as *Adaptive Scanning Algorithm*, since it adaptively scans the interval $[\overline{X}, 1]$ to check the truth of (9).

### 3.2 Sequential Estimation of Mean

In the preceding discussion, we have developed rigorous methods for constructing fixed-sample-size confidence intervals for the mean $\mu$ of the random variable $X$ bounded in $[0,1]$. Now, we are ready to construct a multistage sampling scheme which produces an estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $\mu$ such that $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| < \varepsilon\} \geq 1 - \delta$, where $\varepsilon, \ \delta \in (0,1)$. For this purpose, we consider a sampling procedure of $s$ stages, with sample sizes $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_s$ chosen such that

$$\frac{\ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{\ln \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}} \leq n_1 \leq \frac{\ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{2\varepsilon^2} \leq n_s.$$

At each stage with index $\ell \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$, we use the method described in Section 3.1 to construct a confidence interval $(L_\ell, U_\ell)$ for $\mu$ in terms of $\overline{X}_{n_\ell} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_\ell} X_i}{n_\ell}$ and $\overline{V}_{n_\ell} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (X_i - \overline{X}_{n_\ell})^2}{n_\ell}$ such that $\Pr\{L_\ell < \mu < U_\ell\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$. Then, from Bonferroni's inequality, we have a confidence sequence $\{(L_\ell, U_\ell), \ 1 \leq \ell \leq s\}$ such that $\Pr\{L_\ell < \mu < U_\ell, \ \ell = 1, \cdots, s\} \geq 1 - \delta$. By the inclusion principle, a stopping rule can be defined as follows:

Continue sampling until there exists an index $\ell \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$ such that $\overline{X}_{n_\ell} - \varepsilon \leq L_\ell \leq U_\ell \leq \overline{X}_{n_\ell} + \varepsilon$. At the termination of the sampling process, take $\overline{X}_{n_\ell}$ with the corresponding index $\ell$ as the estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $\mu$.

According to Theorem 1, the estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ for $\mu$ resulted from the above procedure ensures that $\Pr\{|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} - \mu| < \varepsilon\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

### 3.3 Confidence Region for Mean and Variance

In many situations, it might be interested to infer both the mean $\mu$ and variance $\sigma^2$ of $X$. For constructing confidence region for the mean $\mu$ and variance $\sigma^2$, we propose the following method.

**Theorem 4** *Let $\delta \in (0,1)$. Define*

$$\mathscr{A} = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} \leq \nu < 1, \ 0 < \vartheta \leq \nu(1-\nu), \ \varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta) < \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta}, \ \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) < \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right\},$$

$$\mathscr{B} = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} > \nu > 0, \ 0 < \vartheta \leq \nu(1-\nu), \ \psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta) < \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta}, \ \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) < \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right\}$$

*and $\mathscr{D}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}) = \mathscr{A} \cup \mathscr{B}$. Then,* $\Pr\{(\mu, \sigma^2) \in \mathscr{D}(\overline{X}, \overline{V})\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

See Appendix D for a proof. The boundary of $\mathscr{A}$ is a subset of $C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3$, where

$$C_1 = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} \leq \nu < 1, \; \vartheta = \nu(1 - \nu) \right\},$$
$$C_2 = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} \leq \nu < 1, \; 0 < \vartheta \leq \frac{1}{4}, \; \varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right\},$$
$$C_3 = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} \leq \nu < 1, \; W_\nu < \vartheta \leq \frac{1}{4}, \; \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right\}$$
$$\bigcup \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} \leq \nu < 1, \; 0 < \vartheta < W_\nu, \; \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right\}.$$

As a consequence of (3), $\varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\nu$. Hence, the points in $C_2$ can be obtained by solving equation $\varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta}$ for $\nu \in [\overline{X}, 1)$ with a bisection search method. Note that $\phi(W_\nu, \vartheta)$ is non-increasing with respect to $\vartheta \in (0, W_\nu)$ and is non-decreasing with respect to $\vartheta \in (W_\nu, \frac{1}{4})$. It follows that the points in $C_3$ can be obtained by solving equation $\phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta}$ for $\vartheta$ with a bisection search method.

On the other side, the boundary of $\mathscr{B}$ is a subset of $D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$, where

$$D_1 = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} > \nu > 0, \; \vartheta = \nu(1 - \nu) \right\},$$
$$D_2 = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} > \nu > 0, \; 0 < \vartheta \leq \frac{1}{4}, \; \psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right\},$$
$$D_3 = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} > \nu > 0, \; W_\nu < \vartheta \leq \frac{1}{4}, \; \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right\}$$
$$\bigcup \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : \overline{X} > \nu > 0, \; 0 < \vartheta < W_\nu, \; \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta} \right\}.$$

As a consequence of (1), $\psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta)$ is non-increasing with respect to $\nu$. Hence, the points in $D_2$ can be obtained by solving equation $\psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta}$ for $\nu \in [\overline{X}, 1)$ with a bisection search method. Note that $\phi(W_\nu, \vartheta)$ is non-increasing with respect to $\vartheta \in (0, W_\nu)$ and is non-decreasing with respect to $\vartheta \in (W_\nu, \frac{1}{4})$. It follows that the points in $D_3$ can be obtained by solving equation $\phi(W_\nu, \vartheta) = \frac{1}{n} \ln \frac{4}{\delta}$ for $\vartheta$ with a bisection search method.

Finally, we would like to point out that one can apply the same technique to develop confidence intervals and sequential estimation procedures for the mean and variance based on bounding the tail probabilities $\Pr \left\{ \overline{X} \geq z \right\}$ and $\Pr \left\{ \overline{X} \leq z \right\}$ by Bennet's inequalities [1] or Bernstein's inequalities [2].

# 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we have applied inclusion principle to develop extremely simple analytic sequential methods for estimating the means of binomial, geometric, Poisson and bounded random variables. Moreover, we have developed sequential methods for estimating the mean of bounded random variables, which makes use of the information of sample variance. Our sequential estimation methods guarantee the prescribed levels of accuracy and confidence.

# A Derivation of Stopping Rules

For simplicity of notations, define $\mathscr{S} = \{1, \cdots, s\}$.

## A.1 Derivation of Stopping Rule A

We need some preliminary results. As applications of Corollary 5 of [5], we have Lemmas 1 and 2.

**Lemma 1** *Let $\mu \in (0,1)$. Let $m \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1-\mu)$. Then,*

$$\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n < \mu + \frac{(m \vee n)\varepsilon}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\right\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(m \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu+\varepsilon, \mu)\right).$$

**Lemma 2** *Let $\mu \in (0,1)$. Let $m \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu)$. Then,*

$$\Pr\left\{\overline{X}_n > \mu - \frac{(m \vee n)\varepsilon}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\right\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(m \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu-\varepsilon, \mu)\right).$$

**Lemma 3** *Let $y,\ r \in (0,1]$. Then, $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu + r\left(y-\mu\right), \mu\right)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\mu \in (0, y)$.*

**Proof**. From the definition of the function $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}$, we have that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z,\mu) = z \ln \frac{\mu}{z} + (1-z)\ln\frac{1-\mu}{1-z}$ for $z \in (0,1)$ and $\mu \in (0,1)$. It can be checked that $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z,\mu)}{\partial z} = \ln \frac{\mu(1-z)}{z(1-\mu)}$ and $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z,\mu)}{\partial \mu} = \frac{z-\mu}{\mu(1-\mu)}$ for $z \in (0,1)$ and $\mu \in (0,1)$. Now let $z = \mu + r\left(y-\mu\right)$. Since $\mu \in (0,y)$, it follows that $z \in (0,1)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu + r\left(y-\mu\right), \mu\right)}{\partial \mu} &= (1-r)\ln\frac{\mu(1-z)}{z(1-\mu)} + \frac{z-\mu}{\mu(1-\mu)} \\ &\geq \frac{(1-r)(\mu-z)}{\mu(1-z)} - \frac{\mu-z}{\mu(1-\mu)} = \frac{r(\mu-z)(y-1)}{\mu(1-\mu)(1-z)} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 4** *Let $y \in [0,1)$ and $r \in (0,1]$. Then, $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu - r\left(\mu - y\right), \mu\right)$ is non-increasing with respect to $\mu \in (y, 1)$.*

**Proof**. For simplicity of notations, let $z = \mu - r\left(\mu - y\right)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu - r\left(\mu-y\right), \mu\right)}{\partial \mu} &= (1-r)\ln\frac{\mu(1-z)}{z(1-\mu)} + \frac{z-\mu}{\mu(1-\mu)} \\ &\leq \frac{(1-r)(\mu-z)}{z(1-\mu)} - \frac{\mu-z}{\mu(1-\mu)} = \frac{r(z-\mu)y}{\mu(1-\mu)z} \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

□

**Lemma 5** *For $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$, define*

$$L_n^\ell = \begin{cases} \inf\left\{\nu \in (0, \overline{X}_n) : \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\nu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\left(\overline{X}_n - \nu\right), \nu\right) > \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}\right\} & \text{for } \overline{X}_n > 0, \\ 0 & \text{for } \overline{X}_n = 0. \end{cases}$$

*Then, $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.*

**Proof**. First, we need to show that $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined. Since $L_n^\ell = 0$ for $\overline{X}_n = 0$, $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined provided that $L_n^\ell$ exists for $0 < \overline{X}_n \leq 1$. Note that $\lim_{\nu \uparrow y} \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\nu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(y - \nu), \nu) = 0 > \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}$ for $y \in (0,1]$. This fact together with Lemma 3 imply the existence of $L_n^\ell$ for $0 < \overline{X}_n \leq 1$. So, $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined. From the definition of $L_n^\ell$, it can be seen that

$$\{\mu \leq L_n^\ell,\ \overline{X}_n = 0\} = \left\{\mu \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \mu), \mu\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s},\ \overline{X}_n = 0\right\} = \emptyset,$$

$$\{\mu \leq L_n^\ell,\ 0 < \overline{X}_n \leq 1\} \subseteq \left\{\mu \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \mu), \mu\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s},\ 0 < \overline{X}_n \leq 1\right\}.$$

This implies that $\{\mu \leq L_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\mu \leq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \mu), \mu) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\}$.

Next, consider $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$ for two cases as follows.

Case A: $\mu^{m_\ell} \leq \frac{\delta}{2s}$.

Case B: $\mu^{m_\ell} > \frac{\delta}{2s}$.

In Case A, there must exist an $\varepsilon^* \in (0, 1-\mu]$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu + \varepsilon^*, \mu\right) = \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}$. Note that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu + \epsilon, \mu)$ is decreasing with respect to $\epsilon \in (0, 1-\mu)$. Therefore, from the definitions of $L_n^\ell$ and $\varepsilon^*$, we have that $\{\mu \leq L_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\mu \leq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \mu), \mu) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} \subseteq \{\mu \leq \overline{X}_n, \ \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \mu) \geq \varepsilon^*\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_n \geq \mu + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$. This implies that $\{L_n^\ell < \mu\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n < \mu + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Hence, $\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n < \mu + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$. It follows from Lemma 1 that $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq \Pr\{\overline{X}_n < \mu + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(m_\ell \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu + \varepsilon^*, \mu)\right) = 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for all $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.

In Case B, we have $\{\mu \leq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \mu), \mu) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} = \{\mu \leq \overline{X}_n, \ \ln \mu \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \mu), \mu) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} = \emptyset$. It follows that $\{\mu \leq L_n^\ell\} = \emptyset$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Therefore, $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \sum_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \Pr\{\mu \leq L_n^\ell\} = 1$ for all $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$, which implies that $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$ for all $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 6** *For $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$, define*

$$U_n^\ell = \begin{cases} \sup\left\{\nu \in (\overline{X}_n, 1) : \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\nu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\left(\nu - \overline{X}_n\right), \nu\right) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\right\} & \text{for } \overline{X}_n < 1, \\ 1 & \text{for } \overline{X}_n = 1. \end{cases}$$

*Then,* $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu$ *for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ *for all* $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.

**Proof**. First, we need to show that $U_n^\ell$ is well-defined. Since $U_n^\ell = 1$ for $\overline{X}_n = 1$, $U_n^\ell$ is well-defined provided that $U_n^\ell$ exists for $0 \leq \overline{X}_n < 1$. Note that $\lim_{\nu \downarrow y} \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\nu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\left(\nu - y\right), \nu) = 0 > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for $y \in [0, 1)$. This fact together with Lemma 4 imply the existence of $U_n^\ell$ for $0 \leq \overline{X}_n < 1$. So, $U_n^\ell$ is well-defined. From the definition of $U_n^\ell$, it can be seen that

$$\{\mu \geq U_n^\ell, \ \overline{X}_n = 1\} = \left\{\mu \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\mu - \overline{X}_n), \mu\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}, \ \overline{X}_n = 1\right\} = \emptyset,$$

$$\{\mu \geq U_n^\ell, \ 0 \leq \overline{X}_n < 1\} \subseteq \left\{\mu \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\mu - \overline{X}_n), \mu\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}, \ 0 \leq \overline{X}_n < 1\right\}.$$

This implies that $\{\mu \geq U_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\mu \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\mu - \overline{X}_n), \mu) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\}$.

Next, consider $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$ for two cases as follows.

Case A: $(1-\mu)^{m_\ell} \leq \frac{\delta}{2s}$.

Case B: $(1-\mu)^{m_\ell} > \frac{\delta}{2s}$.

In Case A, there must exist an $\varepsilon^* \in (0, \mu]$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\mu - \varepsilon^*, \mu\right) = \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}$. Note that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu - \epsilon, \mu)$ is decreasing with respect to $\epsilon \in (0, \mu)$. Therefore, from the definitions of $U_n^\ell$ and $\varepsilon^*$, we have that $\{\mu \geq U_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\mu \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\mu - \overline{X}_n), \mu) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} \subseteq \{\mu \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\mu - \overline{X}_n) \geq \varepsilon^*\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_n \leq \mu - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$. This implies that $\{U_n^\ell > \mu\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n > \mu - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Hence, $\{U_n^\ell > \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n > \mu - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$. It follows from Lemma 2 that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq \Pr\{\overline{X}_n > \mu - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(m_\ell \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu - \varepsilon^*, \mu)\right) = 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for all $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.

In Case B, we have $\{\mu \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\mu - \overline{X}_n), \mu) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} = \{\mu \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \ln(1-\mu) \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\mu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\mu - \overline{X}_n), \mu) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} = \emptyset$. It follows that $\{\mu \geq U_n^\ell\} = \emptyset$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Therefore, $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \sum_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \Pr\{\mu \geq U_n^\ell\} = 1$ for all $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$, which implies that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$ for all $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 7**

$$\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\}$$
$$= \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s},\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s} \right\}$$

*for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}$ *and* $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.

**Proof**. From the definitions of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}$ and $L_n^\ell$, it is clear that

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s},\ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq 0 \right\} = \{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq 0,\ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell\} \tag{11}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. By Lemma 3 and the definition of $L_n^\ell$,

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s},\ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon > 0 \right\} = \{0 < \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell\} \tag{12}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. It follows from (11) and (12) that

$$\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell\} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s} \right\} \tag{13}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.

On the other hand, from the definitions of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}$ and $U_n^\ell$, it is clear that

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s},\ \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \geq 1 \right\} = \{\overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \geq 1,\ \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \geq U_n^\ell\} \tag{14}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. By Lemma 4 and the definition of $U_n^\ell$,

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s},\ \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon < 1 \right\} = \{1 > \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \geq U_n^\ell\} \tag{15}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. It follows from (14) and (15) that

$$\{\overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \geq U_n^\ell\} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s} \right\} \tag{16}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. Combining (13) and (16) completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 8** *Let* $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ *and* $0 < r \leq 1$. *Then,*

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon) \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon) \qquad \textit{for } y \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right], \tag{17}$$

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon) \geq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon) \qquad \textit{for } y \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]. \tag{18}$$

**Proof**. First, we need to show (17). Note that $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2} \le y \le 1$. For $y \ge 1 - \varepsilon$, we have $0 < y - \varepsilon < y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon \le 1$ and $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon\right) = -\infty < \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon\right)$. Thus, to show (17), it suffices to show $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon\right) \le \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon\right)$ for $\frac{1}{2} \le y < 1 - \varepsilon$. Let $\theta = y + \varepsilon, \ z = y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon$ and $\vartheta = y - \varepsilon, \ w = y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon$. A tedious computation shows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon\right)}{\partial \varepsilon} - \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon\right)}{\partial \varepsilon} \\
& = (1-r) \ln \frac{\theta(1-z)}{z(1-\theta)} \frac{\vartheta(1-w)}{w(1-\vartheta)} - r\varepsilon \left[ \frac{1}{\theta(1-\theta)} - \frac{1}{\vartheta(1-\vartheta)} \right] \\
& \le (1-r) \left[ \frac{\theta(1-z)\vartheta(1-w)}{z(1-\theta)w(1-\vartheta)} - 1 \right] - r\varepsilon \left[ \frac{1}{\theta(1-\theta)} - \frac{1}{\vartheta(1-\vartheta)} \right] \\
& = \frac{r^2 \varepsilon^2 (2y-1)[(r-3)y^2 - (1-r)\varepsilon^2]}{(1-\theta)(1-\vartheta)(y^2 - \varepsilon^2)[y^2 - (1-r)^2\varepsilon^2]} \le 0
\end{aligned}$$

for $\frac{1}{2} \le y < 1 - \varepsilon$. Using this fact and the observation that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon\right) \le \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon\right)$ for $\varepsilon = 0$, we have that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon\right) \le \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon\right)$ for $\frac{1}{2} \le y < 1 - \varepsilon$. Thus, we have shown (17).

Making use of (17) and the relationship that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z, \theta) = \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(1-z, 1-\theta)$ for $z \in [0, 1]$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we can conclude (18).

□

Making use of Lemmas 7, 8 and the fact that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z, \theta) = \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(1-z, 1-\theta)$ for $z \in [0, 1]$ and $\theta \in (0, 1)$, we have the following result as asserted by Lemma 9.

**Lemma 9**

$$\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \le L_n^\ell \le U_n^\ell \le \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left( \frac{1}{2} - \left| \frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n \right| + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \ \frac{1}{2} - \left| \frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n \right| + \varepsilon \right) \le \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s} \right\}$$

*for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.*

**Lemma 10** *Define $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n = \max_{\ell \in \mathscr{S}} L_n^\ell$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n = \min_{\ell \in \mathscr{S}} U_n^\ell$ for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Then, $\Pr\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n < \mu < \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}\} \ge 1 - \delta$.*

**Proof**. Recall that $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}\} \ge 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. By Bonferroni's inequality, we have that $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and all $\ell \in \mathscr{S}\} \ge 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, which implies that

$$\Pr\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \ge 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{19}$$

On the other hand, note that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}\} \ge 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. By Bonferroni's inequality, we have that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and all $\ell \in \mathscr{S}\} \ge 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, which implies that

$$\Pr\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n > \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \ge 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{20}$$

Combining (19) and (20) proves the lemma. □

**Lemma 11** $\Pr\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \le \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \le \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \le \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon$ *for some* $n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$.

**Proof**. By Lemma 9 and the definition of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \text{ for some } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \\
&\geq \Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_s} - \varepsilon \leq L^s_{m_s} \leq U^s_{m_s} \leq \overline{X}_{m_s} + \varepsilon\} \\
&= \Pr\left\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right|,\ \frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of the assumption that $m_s \geq \frac{\ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{2\varepsilon^2}$, we have $\Pr\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\frac{1}{2} - |\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n|,\ \frac{1}{2} - |\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n| + \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} = 1$, from which the lemma follows.

□

Now we are in a position to prove that stopping rule A ensures the desired level of coverage probability. From Lemma 9 , we know that the stopping rule is equivalent to "continue sampling until $\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L^\ell_n \leq U^\ell_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\}$ for some $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$ and $n \in \mathscr{N}$". We claim that this stopping rule implies that "continue sampling until $\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\}$ for some $n \in \mathscr{N}$". To show this claim, we need to show

$$\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathscr{S}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L^\ell_n \leq U^\ell_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\} \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\},$$

which follows from the fact that $\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathscr{S}} \{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L^\ell_n \leq U^\ell_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\}$ for every $n \in \mathscr{N}$. From Lemma 11, we know that the sampling process will terminate at or before the $s$-th stage. It follows from Lemma 10 and Theorem 1 that $\Pr\{|\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \mu| < \varepsilon\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

## A.2 Derivation of Stopping Rule B

Define function $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(.,.)$ such that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z, \theta) = \begin{cases} \frac{9(z-\theta)^2}{2(z+2\theta)(z+2\theta-3)} & \text{for } z \in [0,1],\ \theta \in (0,1), \\ -\infty & \text{for } z \in (-\infty, \infty),\ \theta \notin (0,1). \end{cases}$$

We have established the following result.

**Lemma 12**

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\{\left[\left|\overline{X}_n - \frac{1}{2}\right| - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{3(n \vee m_\ell)}\right]^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} - \left(\frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\right)^2 \frac{m_\ell \varepsilon^2}{2 \ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}\right\} \\
&= \left\{\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell},\ \frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

*for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}$ *and* $\ell \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$.

**Proof**. Let $y \in [0,1],\ r \in (0,1],\ \alpha \in (0,1)$ and $m \in \mathscr{N}$. For simplicity of notations, let $\theta = \frac{1}{2} - \left|y - \frac{1}{2}\right| + \varepsilon,\ z = \theta - r\varepsilon$ and $w = \frac{z + 2\theta}{3}$. Then, $\theta - z = r\varepsilon,\ w = \theta - \frac{r\varepsilon}{3}$ and $w(1-w) = (\frac{1}{2} - w + \frac{1}{2})[\frac{1}{2} - (\frac{1}{2} - w)] = \frac{1}{4} - (\frac{1}{2} - w)^2 > 0$. Moreover, $\theta \in (0,1),\ z \in [0,1]$. It follows that

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z, \theta) \leq \frac{\ln \alpha}{m} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \frac{(r\varepsilon)^2}{\frac{1}{4} - (\frac{1}{2} - w)^2} \geq \frac{2}{m} \ln \frac{1}{\alpha} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \left(\frac{1}{2} - w\right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{m(r\varepsilon)^2}{2 \ln \alpha},$$

which implies that

$$\left[\left|y - \frac{1}{2}\right| - \varepsilon + \frac{r\varepsilon}{3}\right]^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{m(r\varepsilon)^2}{2 \ln \alpha} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - y\right| + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon,\ \frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - y\right| + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{\ln \alpha}{m}.$$

This proves the lemma.

$\square$

As a consequence of Lemma 12, stopping rule B is equivalent to the following stopping rule:

Continue sampling until $\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \ \frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for some integers $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$.

As a consequence of Massart's inequality,

$$\left\{\mathcal{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \ \frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\right\}$$
$$\subseteq \left\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \ \frac{1}{2} - \left|\frac{1}{2} - \overline{X}_n\right| + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\right\}$$

for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \{1, \cdots, s\}$.

Thus, by a similar method as that used in Appendix A.1 to justify that stopping rule A guarantees the desired level of coverage probability, we can show that stopping rule B also ensures that $\Pr\{|\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \mu| < \varepsilon\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

## A.3 Derivation of Stopping Rule C

We need some preliminary results.

**Lemma 13**

$$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{y}{1+\varepsilon} + \frac{r\varepsilon y}{1+\varepsilon}, \frac{y}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \geq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{y}{1-\varepsilon} - \frac{r\varepsilon y}{1-\varepsilon}, \frac{y}{1-\varepsilon}\right)$$

*for* $y, \ r \in (0, 1]$ *and* $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$.

**Proof**. In the case of $y \geq 1 - \varepsilon$, we have $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\frac{y}{1-\varepsilon} - \frac{r\varepsilon y}{1-\varepsilon}, \frac{y}{1-\varepsilon}) = -\infty < \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\frac{y}{1+\varepsilon} + \frac{r\varepsilon y}{1+\varepsilon}, \frac{y}{1+\varepsilon})$. Therefore, it suffices to show the lemma for the case that $0 < y < 1 - \varepsilon$. For simplicity of notations, define $H(\varepsilon) = \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\frac{y(1+r\varepsilon)}{1+\varepsilon}, \frac{y}{1+\varepsilon}\right)$. Then,

$$H(\varepsilon) = \left[1 - \frac{y(1+r\varepsilon)}{1+\varepsilon}\right] \ln \frac{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-y}}{1 + \frac{1-ry}{1-y}\varepsilon} - \frac{y(1+r\varepsilon)}{1+\varepsilon} \ln(1 + r\varepsilon).$$

By virtue of Taylor expansion series

$$\ln(1 + r\varepsilon) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{\ell+1} \frac{r^\ell}{\ell} \varepsilon^\ell, \qquad \ln \frac{1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{1-y}}{1 + \frac{1-ry}{1-y}\varepsilon} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{\ell+1} \frac{1}{\ell} \left[\frac{1}{(1-y)^\ell} - \left(\frac{1-ry}{1-y}\right)^\ell\right] \varepsilon^\ell$$

and a lengthy computation, we have

$$(1 - \varepsilon^2)[H(\varepsilon) - H(-\varepsilon)] = 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} C(r, y, 2k+1) \ (1-y)^{-2k} \varepsilon^{2k+1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C(r, y, \ell) \quad = \quad & \frac{r^{\ell-2}(1-y)^{\ell-1}}{\ell - 2} - \frac{r^\ell (1-y)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} - \frac{(1-ry)(1-y)}{\ell-2} \left[r^{\ell-2}(1-y)^{\ell-2} + 1 - (1-ry)^{\ell-2}\right] \\ & + \frac{1}{\ell} \left[r^\ell (1-y)^\ell + 1 - (1-ry)^\ell\right] - \frac{(1-r)y}{\ell-1} \left[r^{\ell-1}(1-y)^{\ell-1} + 1 - (1-ry)^{\ell-1}\right] \end{aligned}$$

for $\ell > 2$. A tedious computation shows that

$$\frac{\partial C(r, y, \ell)}{\partial r} = \frac{y}{\ell-1} \left[r^{\ell-1}(1-y)^{\ell-1} + 1 - (1-ry)^{\ell-1}\right] + \frac{ry(1-y)}{\ell-2} \left[r^{\ell-2}(1-y)^{\ell-2} + 1 - (1-ry)^{\ell-2}\right] \geq 0.$$

But $C(r, y, \ell) = 0$ for $r = 0$. Thus, $C(r, y, \ell) \geq 0$ for all $r \in [0, 1]$ and $y \in [0, 1]$. This proves that $H(\varepsilon) - H(-\varepsilon) \geq 0$ for $y, \ r \in (0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Thus the lemma is established.

$\square$

**Lemma 14**

$$\left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right\} \supseteq \left\{ \overline{X}_n > 0, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\}$$

*for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}$ *and* $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

**Proof**. From the definitions of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}$ and $L_n^\ell$, it is clear that

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}, \ \overline{X}_n = 0 \right\} = \left\{ \overline{X}_n = 0, \ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \right\} \tag{21}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. By Lemma 3 and the definition of $L_n^\ell$,

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}, \ \overline{X}_n > 0 \right\} = \left\{ 0 < \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \right\} \tag{22}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. It follows from (21) and (22) that

$$\left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \right\} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} \tag{23}$$

for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

From the definitions of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}$ and $U_n^\ell$, it is clear that

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \left( 1 - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}, \ \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \geq 1 \right\} = \left\{ \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \geq 1, \ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \geq U_n^\ell \right\} \tag{24}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. By Lemma 4 and the definition of $U_n^\ell$,

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \left( 1 - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}, \ \varepsilon < \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon < 1 \right\} = \left\{ \varepsilon < \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon < 1, \ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \geq U_n^\ell \right\} \tag{25}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. It follows from (24) and (25) that

$$\left\{ \overline{X}_n > 0, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \left( 1 - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \geq U_n^\ell \right\} \tag{26}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Finally, the proof of the lemma can be completed by combining (23), (26) and using Lemma 13.

$\square$

**Lemma 15** *Define* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n = \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} L_n^\ell$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n = \inf_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} U_n^\ell$ *for* $n \in \mathscr{N}$. *Then,* $\Pr\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \mu \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n$ *for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

**Proof**. Recall that $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. By Bonferroni's inequality, we have that

$$\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N} \text{ and } \ell = 1, \cdots, k\} \geq 1 - \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^k \delta_\ell}{2}$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By the continuity of the probability measure, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N} \text{ and } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\} &= \lim_{k \to \infty} \Pr\{L_n^\ell < \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N} \text{ and } \ell = 1, \cdots, k\}\\ &\geq 1 - \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^k \delta_\ell}{2} = 1 - \frac{\delta}{2},\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\Pr\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{27}$$

On the other hand, note that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. By the continuity of the probability measure and Bonferroni's inequality, we have that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N} \text{ and all } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$, which implies that

$$\Pr\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \geq \mu \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}. \tag{28}$$

Combining (27) and (28) proves the lemma. □

**Lemma 16** $\Pr\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}$ *for some* $n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$.

**Proof**. By the definition of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n$, it is sufficient to show that $\Pr\{\frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq U_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1-\varepsilon} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\} = 1$. From Lemma 14, it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pr\left\{\frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq U_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1-\varepsilon} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\right\}\\ &\geq \Pr\left\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} > 0,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

This inequality and Bonferroni's inequality imply that

$$\begin{aligned}&\Pr\left\{\frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq U_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1-\varepsilon} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\right\}\\ &\geq \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} > 0\} + \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\left\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\right\} - 1.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu > 0$, it follows from the law of large numbers that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} > 0\} = 1$. To complete the proof of the lemma, it remains to show that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\left\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\right\} = 1$. This is accomplished as follows.

Let $0 < \eta < 1$. Noting that $\frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ is negative for any $\ell > 0$ and that $\frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \to 0 > \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\eta\mu, \frac{\eta\mu}{1+\varepsilon})$ as $\ell \to \infty$, we have that there exists an integer $\kappa$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\eta\mu, \frac{\eta\mu}{1+\varepsilon}) < \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for all $\ell \geq \kappa$. For $\ell$ no less than such $\kappa$, we claim that $z < \eta\mu$ if $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon}) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ and $z \in [0, 1]$. To prove this claim, suppose, to get a contradiction, that $z \geq \eta\mu$. Then, since $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon})$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $z \in (0, 1)$, we have $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon}) \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\eta\mu, \frac{\eta\mu}{1+\varepsilon}) < \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have shown the claim and it follows that $\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon}) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} < \eta\mu\}$ for $\ell \geq \kappa$. So,

$$\Pr\left\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon}\right) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\right\} \leq \Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} < \eta\mu\} < \exp\left(-\frac{(1-\eta)^2 \mu m_\ell}{2}\right)$$

for large enough $\ell$, where the last inequality is due to the multiplicative Chernoff bound. Since $m_\ell \to \infty$ as $\ell \to \infty$, we have $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{B}} \left( \overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} = 1$. This proves the lemma.

□

Now we are in a position to prove that stopping rule C ensures the desired level of coverage probability. From Lemma 14, we know that the stopping rule implies that "continue sampling until $\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \}$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathscr{N}$". We claim that this stopping rule implies that "continue sampling until $\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \}$ for some $n \in \mathscr{N}$". To show this claim, we need to show

$$\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right\},$$

which follows from the fact that $\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right\}$ for every $n \in \mathscr{N}$. From Lemma 16, we know that the sampling process will eventually terminate. It follows from Lemma 15 and Theorem 1 that $\Pr\{ |\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \mu| < \varepsilon \mu \} \geq 1 - \delta$.

## A.4 Derivation of Stopping Rule D

We need some preliminary results. As applications of Corollary 5 of [5], we have Lemmas 17 and 18.

**Lemma 17** *Let $\theta \in (1, \infty)$. Let $m \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left\{ \overline{X}_n < \theta + \frac{(n \vee m)\varepsilon}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N} \right\} \geq 1 - \exp\left( m \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta + \varepsilon, \theta) \right).$$

**Lemma 18** *Let $\theta \in (1, \infty)$. Let $m \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \theta)$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left\{ \overline{X}_n > \theta - \frac{(n \vee m)\varepsilon}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N} \right\} \geq 1 - \exp\left( m \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta - \varepsilon, \theta) \right).$$

**Lemma 19** *Let $y \geq 1$ and $0 < r \leq 1$. Then, $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta + r(y - \theta), \theta)$ increases with respect to $\theta \in (1, y)$.*

**Proof**. For simplicity of notations, let $z = \theta + r\,(y - \theta)$. It can checked that $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(z,\theta)}{\partial z} = \ln \frac{z(1-\theta)}{\theta(1-z)}$ and $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(z,\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\theta - z}{\theta(1-\theta)}$. By the chain rule of differentiation and the inequality $\ln(1+x) \leq x$ for $x > -1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\theta + r\,(y - \theta), \theta\right)}{\partial \theta} &= \frac{\theta - z}{\theta(1-\theta)} - (1-r) \ln \frac{\theta(1-z)}{z(1-\theta)} \\ &\geq \frac{\theta - z}{\theta(1-\theta)} - \frac{(1-r)(\theta - z)}{z(1-\theta)} = \frac{(\theta - z)[z - (1-r)\theta]}{\theta(1-\theta)z} = \frac{(\theta - z) r y}{\theta(1-\theta)z} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

□

**Lemma 20** *Let $y \geq 1$ and $0 < r \leq 1$. Then, $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta - r(\theta - y), \theta)$ decreases with respect to $\theta \in (y, \infty)$.*

**Proof**. For simplicity of notation, let $z = \theta - r\,(\theta - y)$. It can checked that $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(z,\theta)}{\partial z} = \ln \frac{z(1-\theta)}{\theta(1-z)}$ and $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(z,\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{\theta - z}{\theta(1-\theta)}$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\theta - r\left(\theta - y\right), \theta\right)}{\partial \theta} &= (1-r)\ln \frac{z(1-\theta)}{\theta(1-z)} - \frac{z-\theta}{\theta(1-\theta)} \leq \frac{(1-r)(z-\theta)}{\theta(1-z)} - \frac{z-\theta}{\theta(1-\theta)}\\ &= \frac{(\theta - z)[(1-r)(\theta-1) - (z-1)]}{\theta(\theta-1)(z-1)} = \frac{(\theta-z)r(1-y)}{\theta(\theta-1)(z-1)} \leq 0.\end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma.

□

**Lemma 21** *For* $n \in \mathscr{N}$ *and* $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$, *define*

$$L_n^\ell = \begin{cases} \inf\left\{\nu \in (1, \overline{X}_n) : \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\nu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\left(\overline{X}_n - \nu\right), \nu\right) > \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}\right\} & \text{for } \overline{X}_n > 1,\\ 1 & \text{for } \overline{X}_n = 1.\end{cases}$$

*Then,* $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ *for* $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.

**Proof**. First, we need to show that $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined. Since $L_n^\ell = 1$ for $\overline{X}_n = 1$, $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined provided that $L_n^\ell$ exists for $\overline{X}_n > 1$. Note that $\lim_{\nu \uparrow y} \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\nu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\left(y - \nu\right), \nu) = 0 > \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}$ for $y \in (1, \infty)$. This fact together with Lemma 19 imply the existence of $L_n^\ell$ for $\overline{X}_n > 1$. So, $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined. From the definition of $L_n^\ell$, it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned}\{\theta \leq L_n^\ell,\ \overline{X}_n = 1\} &= \left\{\theta \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\theta + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \theta), \theta\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s},\ \overline{X}_n = 1\right\} = \emptyset,\\ \{\theta \leq L_n^\ell,\ \overline{X}_n > 1\} &\subseteq \left\{\theta \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\theta + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \theta), \theta\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s},\ \overline{X}_n > 1\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\{\theta \leq L_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\theta \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \theta), \theta) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}\}$.

Next, consider $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$. Since

$$\lim_{t \to \infty}\left[t\ln\frac{t}{\theta} - (t-1)\ln\frac{t-1}{\theta-1}\right] = \lim_{t\to\infty}\left[t\ln\frac{t}{t-1} - \ln(\theta-1) + \ln(t-1) - t\ln\frac{\theta}{\theta-1}\right] = -\infty,$$

there must exist an $\varepsilon^* > 0$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\theta + \varepsilon^*, \theta\right) = \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}$. Note that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta + \epsilon, \theta)$ is decreasing with respect to $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, from the definitions of $L_n^\ell$ and $\varepsilon^*$, we have that $\{\theta \leq L_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\theta \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \theta), \theta) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}\} \subseteq \{\theta \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \theta) \geq \varepsilon^*\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_n \geq \theta + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$. This implies that $\{L_n^\ell < \theta\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n < \theta + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Hence, $\{L_n^\ell < \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n < \theta + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$. It follows from Lemma 17 that $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq \Pr\{\overline{X}_n < \theta + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(m_\ell \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta + \varepsilon^*, \theta)\right) = 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 22** *For* $n \in \mathscr{N}$ *and* $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$, *define* $U_n^\ell = \sup\{\nu \in (\overline{X}_n, 1) : \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\nu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\nu - \overline{X}_n), \nu) > \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}\}$. *Then,* $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$ *for* $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.

**Proof**. First, we need to show that $U_n^\ell$ is well-defined. Note that $\lim_{\nu \downarrow y} \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\nu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\left(\nu - y\right), \nu) = 0 > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}$ for $y \in [1, \infty)$. This fact together with Lemma 20 imply the existence of $U_n^\ell$. So, $U_n^\ell$ is well-defined. From the definition of $U_n^\ell$, it can be seen that $\{\theta \geq U_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\theta \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\theta - \overline{X}_n), \theta) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\}$.

Next, consider $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$ for two cases as follows.

Case A: $\theta^{-m_\ell} \leq \frac{\delta}{2s}$.

Case B: $\theta^{-m_\ell} > \frac{\delta}{2s}$.

In Case A, there must exist an $\varepsilon^* \in (0, \theta - 1]$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\theta - \varepsilon^*, \theta\right) = \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}$. Note that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta - \epsilon, \theta)$ is decreasing with respect to $\epsilon \in (0, \theta - 1)$. Therefore, from the definitions of $U_n^\ell$ and $\varepsilon^*$, we have that $\{\theta \geq U_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\theta \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\theta - \overline{X}_n), \theta) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} \subseteq \{\theta \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\theta - \overline{X}_n) \geq \varepsilon^*\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_n \leq \theta - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$. This implies that $\{U_n^\ell > \theta\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n > \theta - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Hence, $\{U_n^\ell > \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n > \theta - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$. It follows from Lemma 18 that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq \Pr\{\overline{X}_n > \theta - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(m_\ell \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta - \varepsilon^*, \theta)\right) = 1 - \frac{\delta}{2s}$.

In Case B, we have $\{\theta \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\theta - \overline{X}_n), \theta) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} = \{\theta \geq \overline{X}_n, \ \ln \frac{1}{\theta} \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\theta - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\theta - \overline{X}_n), \theta) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} = \emptyset$. It follows that $\{\theta \geq U_n^\ell\} = \emptyset$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Therefore, $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \sum_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \Pr\{\theta \geq U_n^\ell\} = 1$ for $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$, which implies that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \theta \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$ for $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 23**

$$\begin{aligned} & \{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\} \\ & = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\left(1 + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right)\overline{X}_n, (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\right) \leq \frac{\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}}{m_\ell}, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\left(1 - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right)\overline{X}_n, (1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\right) \leq \frac{\ln\frac{\delta}{2s}}{m_\ell} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

*for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.*

**Proof**. From the definitions of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}$ and $L_n^\ell$, it is clear that

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\left(1 - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right)\overline{X}_n, (1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}, \ (1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq 1 \right\} = \{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq 1, \ (1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell\} \tag{29}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. By Lemma 19 and the definition of $L_n^\ell$,

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\left(1 - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right), (1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}, \ (1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n > 1 \right\} = \{1 < (1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell\} \tag{30}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. It follows from (29) and (30) that

$$\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell\} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\left(1 - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right)\overline{X}_n, (1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s} \right\} \tag{31}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. By Lemma 20 and the definition of $U_n^\ell$,

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\left(1 + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right)\overline{X}_n, (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s} \right\} = \{(1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \geq U_n^\ell\} \tag{32}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$. Combining (31) and (32) completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 24** $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left((1 - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon)y, (1-\varepsilon)y\right) \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left((1 + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon)y, (1+\varepsilon)y\right)$ *for* $\varepsilon \in (0, 1), \ r \in (0, 1]$ *and* $y \geq 1$.

**Proof**. In the case of $1 \leq y \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}$, we have $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}((1-\varepsilon+r\varepsilon)y, (1-\varepsilon)y) = -\infty < \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}((1+\varepsilon-r\varepsilon)y, (1+\varepsilon)y)$. Therefore, it suffices to show the lemma for the case that $y > \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}$. For simplicity of notations, let $\nu = (1-\varepsilon)y, \ \vartheta = (1+\varepsilon)y, \ z = (1-\varepsilon+r\varepsilon)y$ and $w = (1+\varepsilon-r\varepsilon)y$. Note that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(z, \nu) = \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(w, \vartheta)$ for $\varepsilon = 0$ and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(z,\nu)}{\partial \varepsilon} - \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(w,\vartheta)}{\partial \varepsilon} \\
&= y(1-r) \ln \frac{\nu(1-z)}{z(1-\nu)} + y \frac{z-\nu}{\nu(1-\nu)} + y(1-r) \ln \frac{\vartheta(1-w)}{w(1-\vartheta)} + y \frac{w-\vartheta}{\vartheta(1-\vartheta)} \\
&= (1-r)y \ln \frac{\nu(1-z)\vartheta(1-w)}{z(1-\nu)w(1-\vartheta)} - r\varepsilon y \left[ \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)(1-\vartheta)} - \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)(1-\nu)} \right] \\
&\leq (1-r)y \left[ \frac{\nu(1-z)\vartheta(1-w)}{z(1-\nu)w(1-\vartheta)} - 1 \right] - r\varepsilon y \left[ \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon)(1-\vartheta)} - \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)(1-\nu)} \right] \\
&= \frac{(r\varepsilon)^2 [r - 3 - (1-r)\varepsilon^2] y(2y-1)}{(1-\nu)(1-\vartheta)(1-\varepsilon^2)[1-(1-r)^2\varepsilon^2]} \leq 0,
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last inequality is a consequence of $r \in (0,1]$ and $y \geq 1$. This proves the lemma.

□

Making use of Lemmas 23 and 24, we have the following result.

**Lemma 25**

$$
\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}} \left( \left( 1 + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right) \overline{X}_n, (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s} \right\}
$$

*for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}$ *and* $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$.

By a similar argument as that for proving Lemma 26, we have established the following result.

**Lemma 26** *Define* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n = \max_{\ell \in \mathscr{S}} L_n^\ell$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n = \min_{\ell \in \mathscr{S}} U_n^\ell$ *for* $n \in \mathscr{N}$. *Then,* $\Pr\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n < \mu < \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n$ *for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

**Lemma 27** $\Pr\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n$ *for some* $n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$.

**Proof**. By Lemma 25 and the definition of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\Pr\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \text{ for some } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \\
&\geq \Pr\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_{m_s} \leq L_{m_s}^s \leq U_{m_s}^s \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_{m_s}\} = \Pr\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_s}, (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_{m_s}\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_s} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s} \right\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

As a consequence of the assumption that $m_s \geq \frac{(1+\varepsilon)\ln \frac{2s}{\delta}}{(1+\varepsilon)\ln(1+\varepsilon) - \varepsilon}$, we have $\Pr\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{G}}(\overline{X}_{m_s}, (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_{m_s}) \leq \frac{1}{m_s} \ln \frac{\delta}{2s}\} = 1$, from which the lemma follows.

□

Now we are in a position to prove that stopping rule D ensures the desired level of coverage probability. From Lemma 25 , we know that the stopping rule is equivalent to "continue sampling until $\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\}$ for some $\ell \in \mathscr{S}$ and $n \in \mathscr{N}$". We claim that this stopping rule implies that "continue sampling until $\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq (1+\varepsilon)\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n\}$ for some $n \in \mathscr{N}$". To show this claim, we need to show

$$
\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathscr{S}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\} \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\},
$$

which follows from the fact that $\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathscr{S}} \{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\} \subseteq \{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_n\}$ for every $n \in \mathscr{N}$. From Lemma 27, we know that the sampling process will terminate at or before the $s$-th stage. It follows from Lemma 26 and Theorem 1 that $\Pr\{(1-\varepsilon)\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} < \theta < (1+\varepsilon)\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}}\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

## A.5 Derivation of Stopping Rule E

We need some preliminary results.

**Lemma 28** *Let $y \geq 0$ and $0 < r \leq 1$. Then, $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda + r(y - \lambda), \lambda)$ increases with respect to $\lambda < y$. Similarly, $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda - r(\lambda - y), \lambda)$ decreases with respect to $\lambda > y$.*

**Proof**. Note that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z, \lambda) = z - \lambda + z \ln \frac{\lambda}{z}$. It can be checked that $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z,\lambda)}{\partial z} = \ln \frac{\lambda}{z}$ and $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z,\lambda)}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{z}{\lambda} - 1$. For simplicity of notations, let $u = \lambda + r\,(y - \lambda)$ and $v = \lambda - r\,(\lambda - y)$. By the chain rule of differentiation,

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\lambda + r\,(y - \lambda)\,, \lambda\right)}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{u - \lambda}{\lambda} - (1 - r) \ln \frac{u}{\lambda} \geq \frac{u - \lambda}{\lambda} - (1 - r) \frac{u - \lambda}{\lambda} = \frac{r(u - \lambda)}{\lambda} \geq 0,$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\lambda - r\,(\lambda - y)\,, \lambda\right)}{\partial \lambda} = (1 - r) \ln \frac{\lambda}{v} + \frac{v - \lambda}{\lambda} \leq (1 - r) \frac{\lambda - v}{v} - \frac{\lambda - v}{\lambda} = \frac{(v - \lambda) y}{v \lambda} \leq 0.$$

This proves the lemma.

□

**Lemma 29** *$\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon\right) \geq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon\right)$ for $\varepsilon > 0,\ y \geq 0$ and $r \in (0, 1]$.*

**Proof**. In the case of $0 \leq y \leq \varepsilon$, we have $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon, y - \varepsilon\right) = -\infty < \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon, y + \varepsilon\right)$. Therefore, it suffices to show the lemma for the case that $y > \varepsilon$. For simplicity of notations, let $\theta = y + \varepsilon,\ \vartheta = y - \varepsilon,\ z = y + \varepsilon - r\varepsilon$ and $w = y - \varepsilon + r\varepsilon$. Note that

$$\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(z, \theta\right)}{\partial \varepsilon} - \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(w, \vartheta\right)}{\partial \varepsilon}$$
$$= r\varepsilon \left( \frac{1}{\vartheta} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) - (1 - r) \ln \frac{zw}{\theta\vartheta} \geq r\varepsilon \left( \frac{1}{\vartheta} - \frac{1}{\theta} \right) - (1 - r) \left( \frac{zw}{\theta\vartheta} - 1 \right) = \frac{(r\varepsilon)^2 (3 - r)}{\theta\vartheta} \geq 0.$$

The proof of the lemma can be completed by making use of this result and the observation that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z, \theta) = \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(w, \vartheta)$ for $\varepsilon = 0$.

□

As applications of Corollary 5 of [5], we have Lemmas 30 and 31.

**Lemma 30** *Let $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. Let $m \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left\{ \overline{X}_n < \lambda + \frac{(m \vee n)\varepsilon}{n} \; \textit{for all}\, n \in \mathscr{N} \right\} \geq 1 - \exp\left( m \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda + \varepsilon, \lambda) \right).$$

**Lemma 31** *Let $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$. Let $m \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \lambda)$. Then,*

$$\Pr \left\{ \overline{X}_n > \lambda - \frac{(m \vee n)\varepsilon}{n} \; \textit{for all}\, n \in \mathscr{N} \right\} \geq 1 - \exp\left( m \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda - \varepsilon, \lambda) \right).$$

**Lemma 32** *For $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, define*

$$L_n^\ell = \begin{cases} \inf \left\{ \nu \in (0, \overline{X}_n) : \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left( \nu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell} \left( \overline{X}_n - \nu \right), \nu \right) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} & \textit{for}\ \overline{X}_n > 0, \\ 0 & \textit{for}\ \overline{X}_n = 0. \end{cases}$$

*Then, $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \lambda$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.*

**Proof**. First, we need to show that $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined. Since $L_n^\ell = 0$ for $\overline{X}_n = 0$, $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined provided that $L_n^\ell$ exists for $\overline{X}_n > 0$. Note that $\lim_{\nu \uparrow y} \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\nu + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\left(y - \nu\right), \nu) = 0 > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for $y > 0$. This fact together with Lemma 28 imply the existence of $L_n^\ell$ for $\overline{X}_n > 0$. So, $L_n^\ell$ is well-defined. From the definition of $L_n^\ell$, it can be seen that

$$\{\lambda \leq L_n^\ell,\ \overline{X}_n = 0\} = \left\{\lambda \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\lambda + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \lambda), \lambda\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2},\ \overline{X}_n = 0\right\} = \emptyset,$$

$$\{\lambda \leq L_n^\ell,\ \overline{X}_n > 0\} \subseteq \left\{\lambda \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\lambda + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \lambda), \lambda\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2},\ \overline{X}_n > 0\right\}.$$

This implies that $\{\lambda \leq L_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\lambda \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \lambda), \lambda) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\}$.

Next, consider $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$. Since $\lim_{t \to \infty} t(\ln \frac{\lambda}{t} - 1) = -\infty$, there must exist an $\varepsilon^* > 0$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\lambda + \varepsilon^*, \lambda\right) = \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$. Note that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda + \epsilon, \lambda)$ is decreasing with respect to $\epsilon > 0$. Therefore, from the definitions of $L_n^\ell$ and $\varepsilon^*$, we have that $\{\lambda \leq L_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\lambda \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda + \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \lambda), \lambda) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} \subseteq \{\lambda \leq \overline{X}_n,\ \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\overline{X}_n - \lambda) \geq \varepsilon^*\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_n \geq \lambda + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$. This implies that $\{L_n^\ell < \lambda\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n < \lambda + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Hence, $\{L_n^\ell < \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n < \lambda + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$. It follows from Lemma 30 that $\Pr\{L_n^\ell < \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq \Pr\{\overline{X}_n < \lambda + \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(m_\ell \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda + \varepsilon^*, \lambda)\right) = 1 - \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 33** *For $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, define $U_n^\ell = \sup\{\nu \in (\overline{X}_n, \infty) : \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\nu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\nu - \overline{X}_n), \nu) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\}$. Then, $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.*

**Proof**. First, we need to show that $U_n^\ell$ is well-defined. Note that $\lim_{\nu \downarrow y} \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\nu - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}\left(\nu - y\right), \nu) = 0 > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for $y \in [0, \infty)$. This fact together with Lemma 28 imply the existence of $U_n^\ell$. So, $U_n^\ell$ is well-defined. From the definition of $U_n^\ell$, it can be seen that $\{\lambda \geq U_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\lambda \geq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\lambda - \overline{X}_n), \lambda) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\}$.

Next, consider $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$ for two cases as follows.

Case A: $\exp(-m_\ell \lambda) \leq \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$.

Case B: $\exp(-m_\ell \lambda) > \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$.

In Case A, there must exist an $\varepsilon^* \in (0, \lambda]$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\lambda - \varepsilon^*, \lambda\right) = \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$. Note that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda - \epsilon, \lambda)$ is decreasing with respect to $\epsilon \in (0, \lambda)$. Therefore, from the definitions of $U_n^\ell$ and $\varepsilon^*$, we have that $\{\lambda \geq U_n^\ell\} \subseteq \{\lambda \geq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\lambda - \overline{X}_n), \lambda) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} \subseteq \{\lambda \geq \overline{X}_n,\ \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\lambda - \overline{X}_n) \geq \varepsilon^*\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_n \leq \lambda - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$. This implies that $\{U_n^\ell > \lambda\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n > \lambda - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n}\}$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Hence, $\{U_n^\ell > \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \supseteq \{\overline{X}_n > \lambda - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\}$. It follows from Lemma 31 that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq \Pr\{\overline{X}_n > \lambda - \frac{(n \vee m_\ell)\varepsilon^*}{n} \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \exp\left(m_\ell \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda - \varepsilon^*, \lambda)\right) = 1 - \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

In Case B, we have $\{\lambda \geq \overline{X}_n,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\lambda - \overline{X}_n), \lambda) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} = \{\lambda \geq \overline{X}_n,\ -\lambda \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\lambda - \frac{n}{n \vee m_\ell}(\lambda - \overline{X}_n), \lambda) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} = \emptyset$. It follows that $\{\lambda \geq U_n^\ell\} = \emptyset$ for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Therefore, $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \sum_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \Pr\{\lambda \geq U_n^\ell\} = 1$, which implies that $\Pr\{U_n^\ell > \lambda \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$ for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 34**

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\} \\
&= \left\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_n + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2},\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\right\}
\end{aligned}$$

*for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$ and $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.*

**Proof**. From the definitions of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}$ and $L_n^\ell$, it is clear that

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}, \; \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq 0 \right\} = \{ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq 0, \; \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \} \tag{33}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. By Lemma 28 and the definition of $L_n^\ell$,

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}, \; \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon > 0 \right\} = \{ 0 < \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \} \tag{34}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. It follows from (33) and (34) that

$$\{ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} \tag{35}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$.

By Lemma 28 and the definition of $U_n^\ell$,

$$\{ \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \geq U_n^\ell \} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} \tag{36}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Finally, combining (35) and (36) proves the lemma.

□

Making use of Lemmas 34 and 29, we have the following result.

**Lemma 35**

$$\{ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}, \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\}$$

*for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}$ *and* $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

By a similar argument as that for proving Lemma 15, we have established the following result.

**Lemma 36** *Define* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n = \sup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} L_n^\ell$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n = \inf_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} U_n^\ell$ *for* $n \in \mathscr{N}$. *Then,* $\Pr\{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \mu \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \text{ for all } n \in \mathscr{N}\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

**Lemma 37** $\Pr\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \text{ for some } n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$.

**Proof**. By the definition of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n$, it is sufficient to show that $\Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} - \varepsilon \leq L_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq U_{n_\ell}^\ell \leq \overline{X}_{m_\ell} + \varepsilon \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\} = 1$. In view of Lemma 35, this is equivalent to show that $\Pr\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \overline{X}_{m_\ell} + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\} = 1$. Note that $\Pr\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \overline{X}_{m_\ell} + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N}\} \geq \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \overline{X}_{m_\ell} + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\}$. To complete the proof of the lemma, it remains to show that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \overline{X}_{m_\ell} + \varepsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} = 1$, which is accomplished as follows.

Let $0 < \eta < 1$. Noting that $\frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \to 0 > \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\frac{\lambda}{\eta}, \frac{\lambda}{\eta} + \varepsilon)$ as $\ell \to \infty$, we have that there exists an integer $\kappa$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\frac{\lambda}{\eta}, \frac{\lambda}{\eta} + \varepsilon) < \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for all $\ell \geq \kappa$. For $\ell$ no less than such $\kappa$, we claim that $z > \frac{\lambda}{\eta}$ if $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z, z + \varepsilon) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ and $z \in [0, \infty)$. To prove this claim, suppose, to get a contradiction, that $z \leq \frac{\lambda}{\eta}$. Then, since $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z, z + \varepsilon)$ is monotonically increasing with respect to $z > 0$, we have $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z, z + \varepsilon) \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\frac{\lambda}{\eta}, \frac{\lambda}{\eta} + \varepsilon) < \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have shown the claim and it follows that $\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \overline{X}_{m_\ell} + \varepsilon) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} > \frac{\lambda}{\eta}\}$ for $\ell \geq \kappa$. So, $\Pr\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \overline{X}_{m_\ell} + \varepsilon\right) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} \leq \Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} > \frac{\lambda}{\eta}\} < \exp(-c m_\ell)$, where $c = -\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\frac{\lambda}{\eta}, \lambda)$ and the last inequality is due to Chernoff bounds [3]. Since $m_\ell \to \infty$ as $\ell \to \infty$, we have $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \overline{X}_{m_\ell} + \varepsilon) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} = 1$. This proves the lemma.

□

Now we are in a position to prove that stopping rule E ensures the desired level of coverage probability. From Lemma 35, we know that the stopping rule implies that "continue sampling until $\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\}$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathscr{N}$". We claim that this stopping rule implies that "continue sampling until $\{\overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon\}$ for some $n \in \mathscr{N}$". To show this claim, we need to show

$$\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \left\{ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \left\{ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right\},$$

which follows from the fact that $\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \overline{X}_n - \varepsilon \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \overline{X}_n + \varepsilon \right\}$ for every $n \in \mathscr{N}$. From Lemma 37, we know that the sampling process will eventually terminate. It follows from Lemma 36 and Theorem 1 that $\Pr\{|\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \lambda| < \varepsilon\} \geq 1 - \delta$.

## A.6 Derivation of Stopping Rule F

We need some preliminary results.

**Lemma 38** $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\frac{(1+r\varepsilon)y}{1+\varepsilon}, \frac{y}{1+\varepsilon}\right) > \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\frac{(1-\varepsilon-r\varepsilon)y}{1+\varepsilon}, \frac{y}{1-\varepsilon}\right)$ *for* $\varepsilon \in (0,1),\ r \in (0,1]$ *and* $y > 0$.

**Proof**. For simplicity of notations, let $\theta = \frac{y}{1+\varepsilon}$, $\vartheta = \frac{y}{1-\varepsilon}$, $z = \frac{y}{1+\varepsilon} + \frac{r\varepsilon y}{1+\varepsilon}$ and $w = \frac{y}{1-\varepsilon} - \frac{r\varepsilon y}{1-\varepsilon}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z,\theta)}{\partial \varepsilon} - \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(w,\vartheta)}{\partial \varepsilon} \\
&= \frac{y}{(1+\varepsilon)^2}(1-r)\ln\frac{z}{\theta} - \frac{y}{(1+\varepsilon)^2}\frac{z-\theta}{\theta} + \frac{y}{(1-\varepsilon)^2}(1-r)\ln\frac{w}{\vartheta} - \frac{y}{(1-\varepsilon)^2}\frac{w-\vartheta}{\vartheta} \\
&= \frac{y(1-r)}{r^2(1-\varepsilon^2)^2}[h(r\varepsilon) + h(-r\varepsilon)],
\end{aligned}$$

where $h(t) = (r-t)^2\ln(1+t) - \frac{t}{1-r}(r-t)^2$. Using $\ln(1+t) = t - \frac{t^2}{2} + \frac{t^3}{3} - \frac{t^4}{4} + \cdots$ for $|t| \leq 1$, we have $h(t) = (r-t)^2\left(-\frac{rt}{1-r} - \frac{t^2}{2} + \frac{t^3}{3} - \frac{t^4}{4} + \cdots\right)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
h(t) + h(-t) &= \left(\frac{4r^2}{1-r} - r^2\right)t^2 - 2\sum_{k=2}^{\infty}\left[\frac{r^2}{2k} + \frac{2r}{2k-1} + \frac{1}{2(k-1)}\right]t^{2k} \\
&> 2t^2\left[\frac{2r^2}{1-r} - \frac{r^2}{2} - \left(\frac{r^2}{4} + \frac{2r}{3} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\frac{t^2}{1-t^2}\right] \\
&\geq 2t^2\left[\frac{2r^2}{1-r} - \frac{r^2}{2} - \left(\frac{r^2}{4} + \frac{2r}{3} + \frac{1}{2}\right)\frac{(r\varepsilon)^2}{1-(r\varepsilon)^2}\right] \\
&= \frac{r^2t^2[18 + 6r - (2r+6)\varepsilon^2 - 13(r\varepsilon)^2 - 3r^3\varepsilon^2]}{6(1-r)[1-(r\varepsilon)^2]} \\
&\geq \frac{r^2t^2[18 + 6r - (2r+6) - 13r - 3r]}{6(1-r)[1-(r\varepsilon)^2]} = \frac{2r^2t^2}{1-(r\varepsilon)^2} \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows $\frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z,\theta)}{\partial \varepsilon} - \frac{\partial \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(w,\vartheta)}{\partial \varepsilon} > 0$. The proof of the lemma can be completed by making use of this result and the observation that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z,\theta) = \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(w,\vartheta)$ for $\varepsilon = 0$.

□

**Lemma 39**

$$\left\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \leq U_n^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}\right\} \supseteq \left\{\overline{X}_n > 0,\ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon}\left(1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell}\right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell}\ln\frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\right\}$$

*for all* $n \in \mathscr{N}$ *and* $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$.

**Proof**. From the definitions of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}$ and $L_n^\ell$, it is clear that

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}, \ \overline{X}_n = 0 \right\} = \left\{ \overline{X}_n = 0, \ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \right\} \tag{37}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. By Lemma 28 and the definition of $L_n^\ell$,

$$\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}, \ \overline{X}_n > 0 \right\} = \{ 0 < \overline{X}_n \leq L_n^\ell \} \tag{38}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. It follows from (37) and (38) that

$$\left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_n^\ell \right\} = \left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} \tag{39}$$

for all $n \in \mathscr{N}$. From the definitions of $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}$ and $U_n^\ell$, it is clear that

$$\left\{ \overline{X}_n > 0, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \left( 1 - \frac{n\varepsilon}{n \vee m_\ell} \right), \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} \subseteq \left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon} \geq U_n^\ell \right\} \tag{40}$$

for $n \in \mathscr{N}$. Finally, combing (39), (40) and using Lemma 38 complete the proof of the lemma.

□

**Lemma 40** $\Pr\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \leq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \leq \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}$ *for some* $n \in \mathscr{N}\} = 1$.

**Proof**. By the definition of $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n$ and $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n$, it suffices to show that $\Pr\{\frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq U_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1-\varepsilon}$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}\} = 1$. From Lemma 39, it can be seen that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq U_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1-\varepsilon} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \\ & \geq \Pr\left\{ \overline{X}_{m_\ell} > 0, \ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This inequality and Bonferroni's inequality imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & \Pr\left\{ \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \leq L_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq U_{m_\ell}^\ell \leq \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1-\varepsilon} \text{ for some } \ell \in \mathbb{N} \right\} \\ & \geq \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} > 0\} + \lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda > 0$, it follows from the law of large numbers that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} > 0\} = 1$. To complete the proof of the lemma, it remains to show that $\lim_{\ell \to \infty} \Pr\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \right) \leq \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} = 1$. This is accomplished as follows.

Let $0 < \eta < 1$. Noting that $\frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ is negative for any $\ell > 0$ and that $\frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \to 0 > \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\eta\lambda, \frac{\eta\lambda}{1+\varepsilon})$ as $\ell \to \infty$, we have that there exists an integer $\kappa$ such that $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\eta\lambda, \frac{\eta\lambda}{1+\varepsilon}) < \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ for all $\ell \geq \kappa$. For $\ell$ no less than such $\kappa$, we claim that $z < \eta\lambda$ if $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon}) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$ and $z \in [0, \infty)$. To prove this claim, suppose, to get a contradiction, that $z \geq \eta\lambda$. Then, since $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon})$ is monotonically decreasing with respect to $z \in (0, \infty)$, we have $\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(z, \frac{z}{1+\varepsilon}) \leq \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\eta\lambda, \frac{\eta\lambda}{1+\varepsilon}) < \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have shown the claim and it follows that $\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon}) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\} \subseteq \{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} < \eta\lambda\}$ for $\ell \geq \kappa$. So,

$$\Pr\left\{ \mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}} \left( \overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon} \right) > \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2} \right\} \leq \Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} < \eta\lambda\}$$

for large enough $\ell$. By the law of large numbers, $\Pr\{\overline{X}_{m_\ell} < \eta\lambda\} \to 0$ for sufficiently large $\ell$. Thus, $\lim_{\ell\to\infty} \Pr\left\{\mathscr{M}_{\mathrm{P}}\left(\overline{X}_{m_\ell}, \frac{\overline{X}_{m_\ell}}{1+\varepsilon}\right) \le \frac{1}{m_\ell} \ln \frac{\delta_\ell}{2}\right\} = 1$. This proves the lemma.

□

Now we are in a position to prove that stopping rule F ensures the desired level of coverage probability. From Lemma 39, we know that the stopping rule implies that "continue sampling until $\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \le L_n^\ell \le U_n^\ell \le \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}\}$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathscr{N}$". We claim that this stopping rule implies that "continue sampling until $\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \le \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \le \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \le \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}\}$ for some $n \in \mathscr{N}$". To show this claim, we need to show

$$\bigcup_{\ell \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \left\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \le L_n^\ell \le U_n^\ell \le \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}\right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathscr{N}} \left\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \le \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \le \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \le \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}\right\},$$

which follows from the fact that $\bigcup_{\ell\in\mathbb{N}} \left\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \le L_n^\ell \le U_n^\ell \le \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}\right\} \subseteq \left\{\frac{\overline{X}_n}{1+\varepsilon} \le \boldsymbol{\mathcal{L}}_n \le \boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}_n \le \frac{\overline{X}_n}{1-\varepsilon}\right\}$ for every $n \in \mathscr{N}$. From Lemma 40, we know that the sampling process will eventually terminate. It follows from Lemma 36 and Theorem 1 that $\Pr\{|\overline{X}_{\mathbf{n}} - \lambda| < \varepsilon\lambda\} \ge 1 - \delta$.

# B Proof of Theorem 2

To show (1), note that

$$[(1-\mu)^2+\theta]^2 \frac{\partial \psi(z,\mu,\theta)}{\partial \mu} = 2(\mu - z)[(1-\mu)^2+\theta] + (1-z)[\theta - (1-\mu)^2] \ln\left(1 + \frac{(z-\mu)[\theta+(1-\mu)^2]}{\theta(1-z)}\right).$$

If $\theta < (1-\mu)^2$, then $\frac{\partial \psi(z,\mu,\theta)}{\partial \mu} < 0$. If $\theta > (1-\mu)^2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{[(1-\mu)^2+\theta]^2}{(1-z)[\theta-(1-\mu)^2]} \frac{\partial \psi(z,\mu,\theta)}{\partial \mu} &= \ln\left(1 + \frac{(z-\mu)[\theta+(1-\mu)^2]}{\theta(1-z)}\right) - \frac{2(z-\mu)[(1-\mu)^2+\theta]}{(1-z)[\theta-(1-\mu)^2]} \\ &\le \frac{(z-\mu)[\theta+(1-\mu)^2]}{\theta(1-z)} - \frac{2(z-\mu)[(1-\mu)^2+\theta]}{(1-z)[\theta-(1-\mu)^2]} \\ &\le -\frac{(z-\mu)[\theta+(1-\mu)^2]}{\theta(1-z)} \le 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < \mu < z$.

To show (2), note that

$$\frac{\partial \psi(z,\mu,\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{(1-\mu)(1-z)}{[(1-\mu)^2+\theta]^2} \left[\ln\left(1 + \frac{(z-\mu)[(1-\mu)^2+\theta]}{\theta(1-z)}\right) - \frac{(z-\mu)[(1-\mu)^2+\theta)}{\theta(1-z)}\right] \le 0.$$

To show (3), note that

$$(\mu^2+\theta)^2 \frac{\partial \varphi(z,\mu,\theta)}{\partial \mu} = 2(\mu-z)(\mu^2+\theta) + z(\mu^2-\theta) \ln\left(1 + \frac{(\mu-z)(\theta+\mu^2)}{\theta z}\right).$$

If $\theta < \mu^2$, then $\frac{\partial \varphi(z,\mu,\theta)}{\partial \mu} > 0$. If $\theta > \mu^2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(\mu^2+\theta)^2}{z(\theta-\mu^2)} \frac{\partial \varphi(z,\mu,\theta)}{\partial \mu} &= \frac{2(\mu-z)(\mu^2+\theta)}{z(\theta-\mu^2)} - \ln\left(1 + \frac{(\mu-z)(\theta+\mu^2)}{\theta z}\right) \\ &\ge \frac{2(\mu-z)(\mu^2+\theta)}{z(\theta-\mu^2)} - \frac{(\mu-z)[\theta+\mu^2]}{\theta z} \ge \frac{(\mu-z)(\theta+\mu^2)}{\theta z} \ge 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $0 < z < \mu$.

To show (4), note that

$$\frac{\partial \varphi(z,\mu,\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \frac{z\mu}{(\mu^2+\theta)^2} \left[\ln\left(1 + \frac{(\mu-z)(\mu^2+\theta)}{z\theta}\right) - \frac{(\mu-z)(\mu^2+\theta)}{z\theta}\right] \le 0$$

for $0 < z < \mu$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

# C Proof of Theorem 3

Define $L(\overline{X}, \theta) = \inf\left\{\nu \in [0, \overline{X}] : \psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \theta) < \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}\right\}$ and $U(\overline{X}, \theta) = \sup\left\{\nu \in [\overline{X}, 1] : \varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \theta) < \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}\right\}$ for $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{4}$. For simplicity of notations, let $G_{\overline{X}}(z) = \Pr\{\overline{X} \geq z\}$. From the definition of $L(\overline{X}, \theta)$, Hoeffding's inequality, and (1) of Theorem 2, we have

$$\{L(\overline{X}, \theta) \geq \mu\} \subseteq \left\{\mu \leq \overline{X},\ \psi(\overline{X}, \mu, \theta) \geq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}\right\}$$
$$= \left\{\mu \leq \overline{X},\ \psi(\overline{X}, \mu, \theta) \geq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n},\ G_{\overline{X}}(\overline{X}) \leq \exp(-n\psi(\overline{X}, \mu, \theta))\right\} \subseteq \left\{G_{\overline{X}}(\overline{X}) \leq \frac{\delta}{3}\right\}.$$

It follows that $\Pr\{L(\overline{X}, \theta) \geq \mu\} \leq \Pr\left\{G_{\overline{X}}(\overline{X}) \leq \frac{\delta}{3}\right\} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}$. In a similar manner, we can show that $\Pr\{U(\overline{X}, \theta) \leq \mu\} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}$. Therefore, by Bonferroni's inequality,

$$\Pr\{L(\overline{X}, \theta) < \mu < U(\overline{X}, \theta)\} \geq 1 - \frac{2\delta}{3}. \tag{41}$$

Now define $\mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) = \sup\left\{\vartheta \in \left[W_\mu, \frac{1}{4}\right] : \phi(W_\mu, \vartheta) < \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}\right\}$ for $0 < \mu < 1$. Let $Y = (X - \mu)^2$. Then, $Y$ is a random variable with mean $\theta = \sigma^2$. Define $\overline{Y} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i - \mu)^2}{n}$. It can be checked that $\overline{Y} = W_\mu$. For simplicity of notations, let $F_{\overline{Y}}(y) = \Pr\{\overline{Y} \leq y\}$. By Hoeffding's inequality, we have $\Pr\{\overline{Y} \leq y\} \leq \exp(-n\phi(y, \theta))$. From the definition of $\mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu)$, Hoeffding's inequality, and the fact that $\phi(W_\mu, \theta)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\theta > W_\mu$, we have

$$\{\mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) \leq \theta\} \subseteq \left\{W_\mu \leq \theta,\ \phi(W_\mu, \theta) \geq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}\right\}$$
$$= \left\{W_\mu \leq \theta,\ \phi(W_\mu, \theta) \geq \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n},\ F_{\overline{Y}}(\overline{Y}) \leq \exp(-n\phi(W_\mu, \theta))\right\} \subseteq \left\{F_{\overline{Y}}(\overline{Y}) \leq \frac{\delta}{3}\right\}.$$

It follows that

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) \leq \theta\} \leq \Pr\left\{F_{\overline{Y}}(\overline{Y}) \leq \frac{\delta}{3}\right\} \leq \frac{\delta}{3}. \tag{42}$$

Define random region

$$\mathcal{D}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}) = \left\{(\nu, \vartheta) : 0 < \nu < 1,\ 0 < \vartheta \leq \nu(1-\nu),\ L(\overline{X}, \vartheta) < \nu < U(\overline{X}, \vartheta),\ \mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \nu) > \vartheta\right\}.$$

Then, from Bonferroni's inequality, $\Pr\{(\mu, \theta) \in \mathcal{D}(\overline{X}, \overline{V})\} \geq 1 - \delta$. By (1), (3) of Theorem 2, and the fact that $\phi(W_\nu, \vartheta)$ is non-decreasing with respect to $\vartheta > W_\nu$, we have $\mathcal{D}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}) = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$, where

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{(\nu, \vartheta) : \nu \in (0, \overline{X}),\ \vartheta \in (0, \nu(1-\nu)],\ \max\left[\psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta),\ \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta)\, \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}}\right] < \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}\right\},$$
$$\mathcal{B} = \left\{(\nu, \vartheta) : \nu \in (\overline{X}, 1),\ \vartheta \in (0, \nu(1-\nu)],\ \max\left[\varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \vartheta),\ \phi(W_\nu, \vartheta)\, \mathbb{I}_{\{\vartheta > W_\nu\}}\right] < \frac{\ln \frac{3}{\delta}}{n}\right\}.$$

Finally, the theorem follows from the observation that $\mathcal{D}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}) = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B}$.

# D Proof of Theorem 4

Define

$$L(\overline{X}, \theta) = \inf\left\{\nu \in [0, \overline{X}] : \psi(\overline{X}, \nu, \theta) < \frac{\ln \frac{4}{\delta}}{n}\right\}, \qquad U(\overline{X}, \theta) = \sup\left\{\nu \in [\overline{X}, 1] : \varphi(\overline{X}, \nu, \theta) < \frac{\ln \frac{4}{\delta}}{n}\right\}$$

for $0 < \theta \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Define

$$\mathcal{L}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) = \inf \left\{ \vartheta \in [0, W_\mu] : \phi(W_\mu, \vartheta) < \frac{\ln \frac{4}{\delta}}{n} \right\}, \qquad \mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) = \sup \left\{ \vartheta \in \left[ W_\mu, \frac{1}{4} \right] : \phi(W_\mu, \vartheta) < \frac{\ln \frac{4}{\delta}}{n} \right\}$$

for $0 < \mu < 1$. By a similar method as that for proving (41), we can show that $\Pr\{L(\overline{X}, \theta) < \mu < U(\overline{X}, \theta)\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$. By a similar method as that for proving (42), we can show that

$$\Pr\{\mathcal{L}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) \geq \theta\} \leq \frac{\delta}{4}, \qquad \Pr\{\mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) \leq \theta\} \leq \frac{\delta}{4}.$$

Therefore, by Bonferroni's inequality, $\Pr\{\mathcal{L}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) < \theta < \mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu)\} \geq 1 - \frac{\delta}{2}$. Again by Bonferroni's inequality,

$$\Pr\{L(\overline{X}, \theta) < \mu < U(\overline{X}, \theta), \; \mathcal{L}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu) < \theta < \mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \mu)\} \geq 1 - \delta.$$

By (1), (3) of Theorem 2 and the unimodal property of $-\phi(W_\mu, \theta)$ with respect to $\theta$, we have that

$$\mathscr{D}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}) = \left\{ (\nu, \vartheta) : 0 < \nu < 1, \; 0 < \vartheta \leq \nu(1 - \nu), \; L(\overline{X}, \vartheta) < \nu < U(\overline{X}, \vartheta), \; \mathcal{L}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \nu) < \vartheta < \mathcal{U}(\overline{X}, \overline{V}, \nu) \right\},$$

which implies that $\Pr\{(\mu, \sigma^2) \in \mathscr{D}(\overline{X}, \overline{V})\} \geq 1 - \delta$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

# References

[1] G. Bennett, "Probability inequalities for the sum of independent random variables," *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, vol. 57, pp. 33–35, 1962.

[2] S. Bernstein, *Theory of Probability*, Moscow, 1927.

[3] H. Chernoff, "A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations," *Ann. Math. Statist.*, vol. 23, pp. 493–507, 1952.

[4] X. Chen, "A statistical approach for performance analysis of uncertain systems," *Proceedings of SPIE Conference*, Baltimore, Maryland, April 24–27, 2012.

[5] X. Chen, "New optional stopping theorems and maximal inequalities on stochastic processes," arXiv:1207.3733v2 [math.PR], July 2012.

[6] X. Chen, "A new framework of multistage estimation," arXiv:0809.1241 [math.ST], multiple versions, September 2008 – November 2009.

[7] X. Chen, "Confidence interval for the mean of a bounded random variable and its applications in point estimation," arXiv:0802.3458 [math.ST], 2009.

[8] W. Hoeffding, "Probability inequalities for sums of bounded variables," *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, vol. 58, pp. 13–29, 1963.